



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 09/804,987 | 03/13/2001 | Christian Waeber | M0765/7035 (ERG/MAT) | 9309 |
| 7590 | 02/05/2004 | | | |
| Edward R. Gates c/o Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C. Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02210-2211 | | | EXAMINER LI, RUIXIANG | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1646 | |
| DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action | Application No. 09/804,987 | Applicant(s) WAEBER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ruixiang Li | Art Unit 1646 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED on 12/31/2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☒ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 34,43,56,88-91,93,96-99,101-105,108-111,113,114,121-131,134 and 137.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 115-120,132,133,135,136,138 and 139.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: (i) new claims 140-148 raise issues related to indefiniteness for missing essential steps, which would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph; (ii) the supplemental figure 1 introduces new matter because there is no support in the specification; and (iii) the amendment presents 9 new claims (claims 140-148), without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the rejection of claims 34, 43, 56, 88-91, 93, 96-99, 101-105, 108-111, 113, 114, 121-131, 134, and 137 under 35 U. S. C. 112, 1st paragraph, as set forth in the record, remains because the amended claims still encompass (i) EDG-5 receptor and (ii) a genus of agents (EDG receptor inhibitors), which are not enabled by the instant disclosure. Applicants continue to argue that the specification provides enablement for the whole scope of the claimed invention, This is not found to be persuasive for the reasons set forth in the record (Paper No. 14, March 11/2003; Paper No. 17, August 26, 2003).

If the amendment were entered, the rejection of claim 104 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph and second paragraph would be withdrawn in view of Applicants' argument.


GARY KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600